PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: September 28, 2015 **Received:** September 21, 2015

Status: Pending_Post

Tracking No. 1jz-819b-z8n0

Comments Due: September 24, 2015

Submission Type: Web

Docket: EBSA-2010-0050

Definition of the Term "Fiduciary"; Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice; Notice of proposed rulemaking and withdrawal of previous proposed rule.

Comment On: EBSA-2010-0050-0204

Definition of the Term Fiduciary; Conflict of Interest Rule- Retirement Investment Advice

Document: EBSA-2010-0050-DRAFT-6205

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-08831

Submitter Information

Name: Jerry Bober

Address:

53 Wayfaring Lane Rochester, NY, 14612 **Email:** jerry_b67@yahoo.com

Phone: 5855201076

General Comment

I believe if you proceed with this rule you will produce an unintended negative effect on retirees such as me. Let me explain.

I have dutifully invested in my 401k and in other IRA accounts all my working life and as a result, have built a portfolio that, while not excessive, should hopefully provide lifetime income for me and my wife.

Part and parcel of this is my continuing to remain invested in the market. To this end I have researched and subscribed to

an independent Retirement Trader Financial Service using my TD America brokerage account.

In order to benefit from this service I have spent many hours researching and learning how prudent Options trading can

safely protect and grow your account, providing additional diversification through covered calls on specifically positioned stocks, which the Service's staff researches and identifies.

The results, which have been very positive, have provided me with considerable peace of mind knowing that I have another

reliable way to protect my portfolio.

I love the freedom I have to invest in the service, complemented by additional advice provided by my brokerage account

in actually making the trades.

By implementing this proposal, you in effect prevent me and countless other retirees doing similar investing from continuing to

improve their investment portfolios so they have to rely less on government programs to finance retirement. I'm sure this wasn't the intent of your proposal, and would appreciate it if you would reconsider its implementation.

